

APPLICANT(S): YELLIN, Daniel
SERIAL NO.: 09/511,737
FILED: February 24, 2000
Page 7

REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-3, 9-11, 13, 16, 18, 23-27, 29, 30, 41, and 53-60 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 9-11, 13, 16, 18, 23-27, 29, 30, 41 and 53-60 have been rejected. Claims 1, 11, 29, 57, 59 and 60 have been amended.

Applicants respectfully assert that the amendments to the claims add no new matter.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3, 9-11, 13, 16, 18, 23-27, 29-30, 41, 53-56 and 60 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. In particular, the Office Action stated that the specification does not support the claimed term "valid" and its accompanying features. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the remarks that follow.

It is well-established that the Examiner may only reject a claim under section 112 if it is reasonable to conclude that one skilled in the art would be unable to carry out the claimed invention. E.g., In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557, 1561-62, 27 USPQ 2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir.

APPLICANT(S): YELLIN, Daniel
SERIAL NO.: 09/511,737
FILED: February 24, 2000
Page 8

1993). *Wright* also states that the Examiner must provide a *reasonable explanation* as to why he believes that the scope of protection provided by that claim is not adequately enabled by the description of the invention provided in the specification. With all due respect, the Examiner has not provided a reasonable explanation.

Applicants would like to kindly point out that claim 1 as amended, disclose a controlled gate to disable the propagation into or within the adapter of a valid signal value received at the first input when a non-valid signal value is received at the second input.

It is well established that the purpose of the claims is only to define the legal metes and bounds of the invention, and not to enable one skilled in the art to practice the invention.

Although the invention is not limited in scope to the embodiments disclosed in the specification, the support for the term “non-valid” was provided in page 3 lines 1-15 (“non-valid” (i.e., temporary incorrect values)). Thus, it should be understood to the person skilled in the art of digital signal processing that a valid signal may be a stable signal at high value (e.g. “1”) or at low value (e.g. “0”) and a non-valid signal may be an unstable signal which includes temporary incorrect values. Furthermore, Applicants’ specification on FIG. 4 provides an example that disclose whether the respective inputs, e.g. lines 80, of adapter 42 are valid or not and their respective values (see also Page 8 lines 5-14).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection of claims 1-3, 9-11, 13, 16, 18, 23-27, 29-30, 41, 53-56 and 60 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph and ask the Examiner to reconsider this rejection in view of these comments.

The Office Action rejected claims 11 and 60 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 11 and 60 have been amended to overcome the deficiencies noted by the Office Action.

It is respectfully asserted that the foregoing amendment merely addresses matters of form and does not change the literal scope of the claim in any way or result in any prosecution history estoppel.

APPLICANT(S): YELLIN, Daniel
SERIAL NO.: 09/511,737
FILED: February 24, 2000
Page 9

Applicants respectfully assert that these amendments render claims 1-3, 9-11, 13, 16, 18, 23-27, 29-30, 41, 53-56 and 60 under 35 U.S.C., 112 first and second paragraphs, and request that the rejections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

The Office Action, rejected claims 57-59 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Fettweiss.

Applicants believe this rejection has been overcome in view of the amendments made above and the remarks that follow.

Independent claims 57 has been amended to include limitations that are not disclosed or suggested by Fettweiss.

It is well established that obviousness requires a teaching or a suggestion by the prior art of all the elements of a claim (M.P.E.P. §2142). Without conceding the appropriateness of the rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that Fettweiss does not meet the requirements of an obvious rejection in that Fettweiss does not disclose or suggest the element of "...a second controlled gate operably coupled to the first register and to a second input of the first adapter..." as claimed in amended claim 57.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.


Applicants note that claims 58-60 depend from claim 57. Thus, in addition to any independent bases for patentability, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 58-60 are similarly patentable over the cited reference by virtue of at least such dependency. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of such claims be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the pending claims are deemed to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

APPLICANT(S): YELLIN, Daniel
SERIAL NO.: 09/511,737
FILED: February 24, 2000
Page 10

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

Please charge any fees associated with this paper to deposit account No. 05-0649.

Respectfully submitted,


Mark S. Cohen
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 42,425

Dated: September 1, 2004

Eitan, Pearl, Latzer & Cohen Zedek, LLP.
10 Rockefeller Plaza, Suite 1001
New York, New York 10020
Tel: (212) 632-3480
Fax: (212) 632-3489